



CITY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT  
CITY COUNCIL TRANSPORTATION, ENERGY &  
UTILITIES COMMITTEE

c/o Department of Public Works  
645 Pine Street, Suite A  
Post Office Box 849  
Burlington, VT 05402-0849

802.863.9094 VOX  
802.863.0466 FAX  
802.863.0450 TTY  
[www.burlingtonvt.gov](http://www.burlingtonvt.gov)

**Councilor David Hartnett, Chair** WARD 4  
**Councilor Maxwell Tracy,** WARD 2  
**Councilor William “Chip” Mason,** WARD 5

**Inquiries:**  
**Nicole Losch**  
802.865.5833 DIRECT  
[nlosch@ci.burlington.vt.us](mailto:nlosch@ci.burlington.vt.us)

**Transportation, Energy and Utilities Committee of the City Council**

**Tuesday, January 15, 2013 at 5:00 – 7:30 PM**

**645 Pine Street, Front Conference Room**

–MINUTES–

Members present: Chair, David Hartnett  
Maxwell Tracy  
Chip Mason

Others present: noted below

Chair Hartnett called the meeting to order at 5:11 pm.

1. Agenda  
Mason moved to accept. Tracy second. All in favor.
2. Public Forum  
No public comments.
3. Minutes of 12/12/2012  
Mason moved to accept. Tracy second. All in favor.
4. Climate Action Plan Draft – Jen Green, CEDO; Sandrine Thibault, Planning & Zoning  
Green: Appreciative of time on agenda. Seeking insight, input and expertise from Committee on Climate Action Plan (CAP). Presented to full Council in July 2012. Have since reorganized the document. Not ready for resolution and full Council review but want TEUC comments to build strategy for full Council review.  
Thibault: At July meeting, presented background of CAP. Was 5-year process. Received many comments and questions in July. Have since rethought formatting, realizing too much emphasis on numbers and not enough on policy. Bottom line goal for CAP: reduce emissions. Will be adopted as part of the Municipal Development Plan. Includes Energy Plan. CAP #1 refers to Energy Plan component. Pg. 12 has red lines, which are updates since draft sent in TEUC packet. Planning Commission has already reviewed and approved CAP.  
Mason: not clear what this was on the agenda, so wasn't prepared to comment. Appears some goals already overseen by TEUC and full Council. Consider Ag Task Force presentation to Council,

which provided clear list of what Council should do. CAP list isn't clear on what issues are Council-related and what they don't influence. Who executes the plan?

Green: resolution gives CAP teeth so actions can be implemented.

Thibault: table on pg. 20 lists lead Departments responsible for implementation of actions.

Hartnett: resolution should dictate how plan will be implemented, who will be responsible.

Mason: also include report back dates.

Green: CAP should be a living document. Projects will be completed but others are ready to be pursued next and are in the plan. 200 total. 37 priority projects.

Hartnett: financial impacts also important and should be addressed in resolution.

Thibault: implementation costs removed from this draft. Should they be added again?

Mason: financial understanding influences implementation, so always important to understand.

Green: Pg. 11 has projects prioritized for ability to be quantified, feasible, etc. so finances have been considered and helped prioritize projects.

Hartnett: Pg. 15 has good example of seemingly realistic goals. Things that could see quick action and have biggest impact on everyone, everyday.

Tracy: recycling totes possible good example. Other bins are inadequate.

Green: resolution can identify "X" number of projects that are easily attainable within 18 months. Could consider totes, employee commute plan, others. Employee commute plan could include price-reduced bus tickets, car share options, bike commute workshops, reward programs for alternate commute, telecommute options.

Mason: typo on pg. 18 #6. Also consider renaming Green Team due to use by others outside of Burlington.

Hartnett: transportation issues are also key, for example walking and biking to schools are strongly encouraged now. Takes years to change behavior, but change is happening.

Green: people are looking to the city to be a leader. City is a bit behind on some initiatives.

Tracy: TEUC is tasked with tar sands resolution. Will look at how city fleet can reduce or remove fossil fueled vehicles. #2 on page 20.

Thibault: DPW fleet manager provided data on all city vehicles and their use. Lots of room for changes and improvements. Needs top-down direction to all departments. Will send data to TEUC.

Tracy: consider contacting Bellingham regarding tar sands and fleet recommendations.

Hartnett: explain car share program?

Thibault: personal accounts for anyone to join; 2 levels to drive-a-little or drive-a-lot. City employees also have access. Long trips have been less expensive using car share instead of reimbursing employees for personal vehicle use.

Hartnett: Council could require employees consider car share use for long trips.

Green: TEUC can provide more comments on CAP? Should they return for another presentation with a draft resolution, including bullets?

Hartnett: yes.

Mason: comments in advance? By February 11, 2013. Seek TEUC review at meeting on February 19. Prefer to meet at city hall since Council meets that evening also.

Hartnett: will try to get to full Council in March, aim for March 6 resolution.

5. Transportation Alternatives 2013 Grant Candidate: Waterfront Bike Path Section 3 – Nicole Losch, DPW

Losch: Annual grant program through Vermont Agency of Transportation. Due to change in Federal legislation in 2012, program changed from Transportation Enhancements to Transportation Alternatives. Memo describes types of projects that are eligible. City selects

projects through collaboration with other departments. \$300,000 available, requires 20% local match. Considered Sherman Street Stairs, but costs exceed grant available funds. Considered City Hall Park, but couldn't identify a standalone project yet; needs more consideration for how to phase that project. Recommend city pursue rehabilitation and realignment of Section 3 of the waterfront bike path, from Blodgett Building to the Barge Canal Beach, 0.2 miles. Bike Path Feasibility Study estimated \$210,000 project cost. DPW reevaluating budget, which appears slightly lower than initial estimate. Parks Department has identified two sources of match, up to \$75,000. Penny for Parks program and Bike Path Improvement and Maintenance Program. Seeking letter of support for financial match and continued maintenance from CAO. Grant requires public meeting, but staff would also like TEUC to support project for grant submittal. Hartnett: would have liked to see City Hall Park improvements, but understands it needs more work. Likes bike path improvements and that local match source has been found.

Mason: Penny for Parks is competitive, so what happens if Council doesn't support match from this program?

Losch: good question. Not fully versed in details of Penny for Parks program, but could either push for approval for match in a future year (project could be split over fiscal years) or could see if program includes prioritization criteria that strongly supports projects leveraging other funds, as city capital program does.

Hartnett: reasonable concern, but bike path repair is strongly supported.

Mason: ballot was overwhelmingly supported and strong public push for repairs. If CAO is okay with commitment to match, he's okay too.

Mason: move to accept recommendation for grant application for Section 3 of the bike path.

Tracy second. All in favor.

#### 6. Councilor's updates

Tracy: discuss how toters can get to more properties, especially large rental homes in Wards 1 and 2? Blowing trash is a big issue.

Losch: toters are available. \$48 and change, one time fee. Some landlords are hesitant, speculate that hesitation is for maintenance of anything else on the property. Code Enforcement and Mayor's Office also want to see more. Code is strongly encouraging landlords to purchase them. Has offered to waive fines related to trash but some landlords pay the expensive fines rather than buy toters. Unsure of how else to encourage purchase. Already subsidizing.

Mason: space is an issue for some properties. Could increase fine level incrementally for repeat offenders as incentive to just purchase a toter? Could finance toter purchase?

Losch: could evaluate options for financing.

Hartnett: could program go bi-weekly? How is program funded?

Losch: DPW provides residential recycling services. Study many years ago found city operation was less expensive than contracted operation. Funded by business tax on collection of solid waste. Haven't raised taxes in many years, still trying to keep tax level and not increase it. Don't have finances to purchase toters for city-wide launch.

Mason: consider requiring toters for all multi-unit properties and find a way to finance it.

Tracy: will contact Code for more information.

Tracy: tar sands resolution? How to move discussion forward and meet March deadline for report back?

Dave: February agenda item.

Mason move to adjourn. Tracy second. All in favor. Adjourned at 6:22 pm